

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-10, 16, and 17 were previously withdrawn, leaving claims 11-15 at issue in this amendment.

Claim 13 has been amended in accordance with the examiner's objection and suggestion to replace the word "adjaace" in line 2 to the word --adjacent--. This amendment corrects a typographical error and does not change the scope of or add new matter to claim 13.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 11-15 as either anticipated or rendered obvious by Frick et al. (US 4,281,619).

Claim 11, and claims 12-15 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, recite an apparatus for applying an adhesive to a substrate including a housing having an inlet passage, a plurality of dispensing passages with exit openings, and a recess in fluid communication between the inlet passage and the exit openings. A rotatable valve element is disposed in the recess and has a plurality of apertured sections, each aligned with a dispensing passage and having a separate entry opening through an exterior surface of the valve. A first one of the apertured sections is circumferentially offset from a second one of the apertured sections.

The prior art does not disclose or suggest an apparatus for applying an adhesive to a substrate as recited in claims 11-15, including a valve having a plurality of apertured sections each aligned with a dispensing passage and having a separate entry opening through an exterior surface of the valve.

Rather, Frick et al. discloses a valve apparatus for applying measured amounts of adhesive in a broken longitudinal line pattern along a continuously moving sheet. The apparatus includes a housing with having a rotational valve extending between an inlet and an exit orifice and a housing return orifice. The valve includes a single axial inlet bore extending from an entry opening through an exterior surface located at an axis of rotation of the valve. The inlet bore is in fluid communication with the inlet and a discharge passage and a housing return passage, each extending radially outwardly from the axial inlet bore to an external surface of the valve. The discharge passage is aligned with the exit orifice, and the housing return orifice is aligned with a housing return passage. The discharge passage is circumferentially offset from the housing return passage.

Further, the claims at issue are not obvious because the prior art does not disclose a suggestion of an incentive to make the claimed combination. "To establish a *prima facie* case

of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." See MPEP §2143. There is no suggestion in the prior art to modify the valve apparatus in Frick et al. to include a valve having a plurality of apertured sections each aligned with a dispensing passage and having a separate entry opening through an exterior surface of the valve. Rather, Frick et al. specifically suggests only a single discharge passage and only a single axial inlet bore through an exterior surface of the valve located at a rotational axis of the valve. To change the Frick et al. design to have more than one inlet bore through an exterior surface of the valve would require a substantial redesign of the disclosed valve apparatus and substantially change the principal of operation of the valve apparatus since there is only a single rotational axis of the valve at which an axial inlet bore can be located. "If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious." See MPEP §2143.02 (citing *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)).

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims at issue and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank LLP  
200 W. Adams  
Suite 2150  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 263-4700  
Facsimile: (312) 263-3990  
Customer No.: 29471

Date: May 5, 2005

By: 

Thomas P. Riley  
Reg. No. 50,556